



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The
American Historical Review

THE MEETING OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL
ASSOCIATION AT CINCINNATI

THE thirty-second annual meeting of the American Historical Association was held at Cincinnati on Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, and Saturday, December 27-30, 1916. Besides the advantages and pleasures arising from Cincinnati's geographical position, its climate, its picturesque situation, and its pleasant spirit of hospitality, the convention had those which always arise from holding nearly all its sessions under one roof—in this case the comprehensive roof of the Hotel Sinton. The morning and afternoon sessions of one day were, however, held with great pleasure at the University of Cincinnati, where an agreeable luncheon was followed by entertaining speeches. For the highly successful arrangements which marked the sessions at every point, cordial thanks are due to the Local Committee of Arrangements, and especially to its secretary, Professor Isaac J. Cox. Mr. Charles P. Taft, chairman of that committee, and Mrs. Taft entertained the Association at a reception and tea, made memorable not only by their kindness but by the extraordinary beauty of their collection of paintings.

Noteworthy among other social diversions was the "smoker" provided for the men of the Association on one of the evenings, at the Hotel Gibson. In the rooms of the Auto Club, on the same evening, the women members had a subscription dinner. A reception following the exercises of one of the other evenings gave opportunity for general conversation and acquaintance, and indeed the meeting seems to have been particularly successful on the side of sociability. The rooms of the Historical and Philosophical Society of Ohio, Van Warner Library, were thrown open to members on the day of the visit to the University. The chief clubs of the city offered the privileges of their houses.

One feature of the social aspect of the convention deserves a

special mention, for it is susceptible of much further extension and if so extended may bring many useful results. This was the plan of devoting one evening, purposely left free of public exercises, to various dinners of members interested in some special branch of historical study, at which informal conversations and discussions of its affairs may take place. Out of such dinners and discussions many valuable projects and suggestions may come, many steps in advance, for the promotion of this or that line of study in America—of modern German or medieval economic history, of the Protestant Reformation or the Industrial Revolution, of American diplomacy or American agriculture or American religion—or at the least much quickening of interest in advanced researches (which perhaps the Association now does too little to foster), much interchange of opinion, much increase of helpful friendships. All that is necessary, in each such specialty, is to designate an energetic and judicious member to gather the appropriate company together at such dining place as the local committee may recommend. The undertaking is not more difficult than the organization of the breakfasts, of late somewhat frequent at the Association's meetings, of those who have been graduate students at the same university—pleasant reunions, but not likely to be so fruitful for our sacred science or profession as dinners of the sort described, dinners of *Fachgenossen*.

A small beginning of such a practice was made at the time of the Washington meeting. At Cincinnati it was but slightly extended, but there was a successful and profitable dinner of those concerned with European history, and another of those interested in the founding of a journal of Latin-American history. The project was canvassed with considerable enthusiasm, and a committee, of which Dr. James A. Robertson is chairman, was appointed to consider the matter further and, if the plan ultimately seems feasible, to devise machinery for bringing it into effect. Another conference, unaccompanied by a dinner, and perhaps for that reason less affirmative in its results—such is Fallen Man!—had been called to consider the foundation of an American journal of European history, mainly in order to furnish larger opportunities for the publication of technical articles than can be afforded by a general historical journal or other existing means. The nature of the plan, and its possibilities for the advancement of scientific research, were set forth by Professor George B. Adams, and a committee was appointed, with Professor Dana C. Munro as chairman, to give it further consideration. It is to be expected, as a sign of healthy progress of historical study in the United States, that, besides many good journals of local his-

tory, an increasing number of specialized historical journals should arise—indeed, several have already come into existence—and toward any such, having the standards that may fairly be expected, the *American Historical Review* can have no attitude but that of welcome, and of helpfulness if it can be of help.

Still another informal conference, outside of those more formal meetings whose programmes had been arranged by the Association, was that of members interested in the foundation in Washington of a centre of university studies in history, political economy, and political science, which may do for those studies what the American Schools of Classical Studies in Athens and Rome have done for those branches of learning, may furnish guidance to students in the three sciences named who come to Washington to avail themselves of its surpassing opportunities for such studies, and may provide them with the incentive of fruitful companionship in a common place of residence. Respecting this project, which in the existing circumstances of the District of Columbia has rich possibilities, the committee appointed last spring submitted a printed report which appeared to meet with emphatic favor, and received the cordial endorsement of the Executive Council.

Three allied organizations, the American Political Science Association, the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, and the Ohio Valley Historical Association, met in Cincinnati in the same December days, and joint sessions were held in some cases, with common profit. The number of members of the American Historical Association who registered at headquarters was 325. Most of those attending came, as was to be expected, from places comparatively near at hand, yet the range of geographical distribution was wide; an exceptional number of members were present from the Pacific Coast.

The programme of the Association's sessions, prepared by a committee of which Professor Henry E. Bourne, of Western Reserve University, was chairman, deserved particular commendation for its breadth of range, and for the especial attention it assigned to recent periods and vital themes. History cannot expect to be much regarded by the present-day world if it has nothing to say of present or recent affairs; and a society which has given such signal evidences of harmony and right feeling, has surely no need to fear the divisive effects of discussion, in fields in which historians are expected to have opinions, facts, and reasons, but in which they may also be expected—or our training is naught—to preserve good temper and the habit of seeing both sides. Sessions, therefore, devoted to

Recent Phases of the European Balance of Power, to the Great Peace Congresses of the Nineteenth Century, to the American period in the Philippines, and to the modern as well as the medieval portion of the History of Constantinople, and of China and Japan, did much to invest the whole meeting with exceptional interest and value. There was also a session for ancient history, one for general history (a nondescript miscellany of papers), one for English history, and two for American history, one of which was held as a joint session with the Mississippi Valley Historical Association.

Taken as a whole the programme was impressive. It may even be called formidable. Seventeen formal sessions in three and a half days is too much. It may well be doubted whether it is ever desirable to have more than two sessions going on at the same time. On this present occasion, besides the sessions already mentioned, for the reading of written papers on substantive portions of history, and the evening session in which the presidential addresses (of this society and of the American Political Science Association) were delivered, and the business session, there were conferences of archivists, of state and local historical societies, and of patriotic hereditary societies, a conference for discussion of the field and method of the elementary course in college history, and a conference of teachers of history in secondary schools. For a registration of 325, this is a very extensive programme; but it was agreed on all sides that it was well composed, and in most particulars the participants, chosen mostly from among the younger members of the Association, carried it out with intelligence and excellent success.

By an arrangement not to be recommended for imitation in subsequent years, the presidential addresses were not delivered until the tenth of these seventeen sessions. Indeed, as the annual business meeting had been the ninth, and as on that occasion the terms of officers had been defined as ending, each year, with the conclusion of that session, the odd situation was presented of the president of the American Historical Association reading his presidential address after he had technically gone out of office. After an address of welcome by Mr. Taft, who presided as chairman of the joint meeting, Professor Jesse Macy, of Grinnell College, president of the American Political Science Association, delivered an address on the Scientific Spirit in Politics.¹ The admirable address of Professor George L. Burr, of Cornell University, president of the American Historical Association, on the Freedom of History, we had the pleasure of printing in the last number of this journal.

¹ Printed in the *American Political Science Review* for February, 1917.

In some of the conferences, it must be confessed, members scheduled to participate took their obligations so lightly as neither to appear nor to take suitable measures to secure the presentation of their papers in their absence. In the conference of archivists, presided over by Dr. Solon J. Buck, only two of the four papers mentioned in the programme were read. The one, entitled *Some Considerations on the Housing of Archives*, was by Mr. Louis A. Simon, of Washington, superintendent of the drafting division in the office of the supervising architect of the Treasury, who as such has prepared the plans for the proposed National Archive Building in Washington; the other, on the *Problem of Archive Centralization with reference to Local Conditions in a Middle Western State*, was by Dr. Theodore C. Pease, of the University of Illinois. Mr. Simon's suggestions related chiefly to the problems of a large, or national, archive building. All the varieties of plan now most in favor indicate a marked differentiation of the space devoted to administrative functions from the space assigned to actual storage of the records. The various forms by means of which this may be achieved, and through which the spaces devoted to administrative officials, to physical manipulation and cataloguing, and to purposes of study may be related to each other, were described in outline. On the principle, however, that much the greater part of the space must be storage-space, the main consideration was given to the forms and varieties of stacks.

Dr. Pease emphasized the thought that the problems of centralization of local archives must receive an independent solution in each state, in accordance with varying institutions and conditions, and professed to speak only, by way of example, of what was true in the single state of Illinois. His paper drew a distinction between centralization applied to records useless for public business, in order to preserve them for the use of the historian or the student of society, and centralization designed in the interests of economy, to bring together in central repositories, at the state capital or in several centres, records not of current use but having importance as legal monuments. Centralization in the latter sense will be the problem of the future. For centralization of the former variety, now sometimes a pressing problem, Dr. Pease advocated clear and uniform criteria for deciding on the separation, tact in reconciling local susceptibilities to it, and caution in removing papers from the neighborhood of other papers to which they stand related, and entered somewhat into consideration of classes appropriate for transfer. There was some general discussion of the destruction of useless papers,

and of the defects of local, especially township, record-keeping. Dr. Gaillard Hunt, upon request, described the methods used by his division of the Library of Congress in the repair of manuscripts.

In the conference of historical societies, the main topic of discussion was that of the federating and affiliating of local historical societies. The chairman, Professor Harlow Lindley, of the Indiana Historical Commission, adverted to the timely importance of the theme in a period when a considerable number of states are celebrating or are about to celebrate the centennial anniversaries of their entrance into the Union. Such commemorations, especially those organized by county committees, bring local historical societies into existence or into increased activity. The impulse ought not to be allowed to expire with the fireworks, and state historical societies or commissions should be able so to co-ordinate and supervise the activities of these societies that they may make definite and valuable contributions to the intellectual life of the state, with good results in enlightened citizenship. The modes in which such work is encouraged and correlated in various states were outlined by a succession of speakers, Mr. Thomas L. Montgomery, state librarian of Pennsylvania, describing the operations of the Pennsylvania Federation of Historical Societies, Mr. A. F. Hunter of Toronto that of the Ontario Historical Society, Dr. George N. Fuller that of the Michigan Historical Commission, of which he is secretary, Mrs. Jessie Palmer Weber that of the Illinois State Historical Society, Mr. Nathaniel T. Kidder that of the Bay State Historical League. Much information respecting such endeavors may be derived from the Michigan Historical Commission's bulletin entitled *Suggestions for Local Historical Societies and Writers in Michigan*, which Mr. Fuller described, along with the relations between his commission and the state society, the county societies, the newspapers, the schools, and the women's clubs, and the procedure followed in bringing local societies into existence. In all the local work, special emphasis is laid on the collection and preservation of original materials.

The most important event in relation to this conference was the vote of the Association, pursuant to a recommendation of the Executive Council, conferring upon the conference a semi-autonomous status and organization, with a definite membership, with funds of its own, obtained by small assessments upon member societies and commissions, with a programme made by its appointees (their chairman to be *ex officio* a member of the Association's programme committee), and with definite obligations of annual report to the parent

body. The secretary of the conference is to be appointed, as now, by the Executive Council of the Association, its other officers to be elected by the conference itself. At the instance of the conference, and largely by the generosity of the Newberry Library, provision has been made for the continuance by supplement, from 1905 to 1915, of Mr. A. P. C. Griffin's *Bibliography of American Historical Societies*, printed as volume II. of the Association's *Annual Report* for 1905.

The conference of the hereditary patriotic societies was preceded by a luncheon of the representatives present, some fifty in number. The chairman of the meeting, Mr. Harry B. Mackoy, formerly presiding officer of two such societies in Ohio, set forth its purpose, which was to consider practical and desirable plans of closer co-operation between the historical associations of the country and the numerous hereditary patriotic societies. The latter are in part historical societies, with a membership of between two hundred and three hundred thousand, and constitute a great force for the development of historical interests in America. No one could listen to the reports of historical work made on the present occasion, especially from the women's societies, without being deeply impressed with the merit of their activities, the fine spirit of patriotism animating them, and the possibilities and prospects of their achievement in historical lines. Reports were made on behalf of the National Society of the Colonial Dames of America, by Miss Cornelia B. Williams, their national historian; for the Daughters of the American Revolution, by Mrs. Thomas Kite, formerly vice-president-general of that society; for the Society of the Sons of the Revolution, by Mr. Jackson W. Sparrow, ex-president of the Ohio society; for the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, by Mr. R. C. Ballard Thruston, ex-president-general; for the Society of Colonial Wars, by Mr. Elmer L. Foote, of the Ohio Society. The last report was illustrated by stereopticon views of historical sites marked, monuments erected, and the like. A report from the National Society of the United States Daughters of 1812, prepared by its president-national, Mrs. Robert H. Wiles, was also presented. The discussion which followed centred mainly about the report made to the Council of the American Historical Association by Dr. Gaillard Hunt as chairman of its Historical Manuscripts Commission, in which attention was called to the assistance that might be rendered by hereditary patriotic societies and their members in the collecting, preserving, and rendering accessible many private manuscripts of historical value. A plan for such co-operation was outlined.

Of the educational conferences, that which concerned the field and method of the elementary college course in history, presided over by Professor Arley B. Show, of Stanford University, was much the more profitable. Previous discussions of the subject at the annual meetings of 1896, 1905, and 1906 were summarized by the chairman, who held that the time was ripe for some further standardization of first-year work in college history. Three requisites of the ideal course were, he maintained, that it should contain the best teaching materials, that it should lie within the student's comprehension, and that it should prepare his mind for his later work in history. The method to be pursued, he thought, should be that which each teacher can do best, but it should be graded in such a manner as to fit into the higher work in history, and it should include some work in an historical laboratory and carefully supervised study.

Four papers dealing with the field of the elementary college course were read: by Professor William A. Frayer, of the University of Michigan, Professor James F. Baldwin, of Vassar College, Mr. Jesse E. Wrench, of the University of Missouri, and Mr. Milton R. Gutsch, of the University of Texas. The general opinion favored the maintenance of but one general introductory course for all students alike. Even students who have covered the given field in the work of the secondary school were said to benefit by traversing the same field in the introductory college course. There was substantial agreement among the speakers in holding that the field of the introductory course should be taken from European history, though there were differences as to what phase of European history should be treated. The fields proposed were, in the order of choice: medieval and modern history, general history, medieval history, modern history, and English history.

In the discussion of the method to be pursued in this introductory course, many interesting experiences were presented. The speakers were Messrs. Curtis H. Walker, of the University of Chicago, Clarence P. Gould, of the College of Wooster, Wilmer C. Harris, of Ohio State University, Carlton J. H. Hayes, of Columbia University, Donald L. McMurry, of Vanderbilt University, and James G. McDonald, of Indiana University. The general sentiment seemed to favor abolishing the formal lecture system, dividing the class into small groups of twenty-five or thirty students, and placing each under the care of one competent teacher for the entire course. This method has been adopted at the University of Chicago, at Columbia University, and at some other institutions, but it is

very expensive, and it is always hard to obtain competent men who will take the section work. Many institutions reported a combination of the lecture and the quiz system, by which one or two lectures a week are given to the entire class, and small sections for conference or recitation are held once or twice a week. Particular emphasis was placed upon an adequate system of note-books, and on the need of an intelligent study of historical geography. The use of sources was incidentally discussed, but was not strongly advocated for extensive use in the introductory course.

The conference of teachers of history in secondary schools (Dr. James Sullivan, of the New York State Education Department, chairman) had a much more miscellaneous programme. Professor Carl E. Pray, of the State Normal School at Ypsilanti, Michigan, advocated a more intensive study of historical personalities in the high schools, and illustrated his thesis by details from the lives of prominent Americans. Mr. Glen L. Swiggett, of the United States Bureau of Education, made an extended plea for adequate preparation in the secondary schools for consular service and similar government positions. Dr. Frank P. Goodwin described the efforts made by the University of Cincinnati, in its elementary course in general history, to lay emphasis upon economic and industrial facts without failing to expound cultural values. Professor Albert E. McKinley, of the University of Pennsylvania, showed some ways in which the teaching of history in the schools of France, Germany, and England had been influenced by the current war. Professor Samuel B. Harding, of Indiana University, pointed out the difficulties which the writer of historical text-books has in maintaining an attitude of neutrality. He called attention to letters which had been received by his publishers protesting against a proposed chapter of *Neueste Geschichte* added to one of his books in the process of preparing a new edition. The writers of these letters, from sentiments of nationality (not American nationality), threatened the boycott in their state not only of all the speaker's books, but of all other educational publications issued by his publishers.

Theoretically, the distinction between the sessions which have thus far been described and those which remain to be dealt with, lies in the fact that the latter were sessions for the reading of formal papers, while the former were freer conferences, intended to be marked by a greater amount of informal discussion. But large as is the part played in professorial life by extempore discourse, not to say, in these days, by lively dispute, there seems to be a perpetual difficulty in composing our free conferences of anything but pre-

pared papers. But at all events there is a distinction in that the papers now to be spoken of related to the substance of history rather than to its methods or organization. They covered a wide range, from ancient Mesopotamia to the Southern Confederacy. To the reader of these pages the order and method of their grouping at Cincinnati is a matter of indifference, and they may better be described in something approaching a chronological order. If any receive an insufficient description, the defect may sometimes be ascribed to neglect of the secretary's customary request for the delivery of summaries beforehand and of manuscripts afterward, for no managing editor can manage to attend three sessions at the same hour.

In any such order of arrangement, the first place may naturally be given to an essay by Professor Alfred T. Olmstead, of the University of Missouri, on Mesopotamian Politics and Scholarship, though it touched the latest as well as the earliest dates. The present war having brought a cessation to scientific field-work in western Asia, there is a good occasion for retrospect. Ancient history in the Near East has during these eighty years of its modern development been largely studied and aided by those who have been making modern history in that same region, and its progress, as the speaker showed in detail, has been conditioned by the course of politics. Scholarship has been nationalistic in character, and its phases have followed those of political control. The French and German archaeological investigators, backed by their respective governments, have had large success in appropriating the Mesopotamian field; the German policy of removing important finds to Berlin has been pushed to an unjustifiable extreme.

In the absence of its writer, a paper by Miss Ellen C. Semple of Louisville on Climatic and Geographic Influences upon Ancient Mediterranean Agriculture was presented only in outline, and its discussion by Professor William L. Westermann, of the University of Wisconsin, was limited to a general criticism of the methods of reasoning employed by historical geographers working in ancient history, though upon sound data, of the insufficiency of their training in those rigorous methods of criticism of sources which have been developed in ancient history, and of their failure to consider adequately the obvious variants from their general principles of the operation of constant geographic factors.

Professor Herbert Wing, of Dickinson College, in a paper on Tribute Assessments in the Athenian Empire, rejected all notions that the frequent revolts in that empire were due to the tribute or

to any constant economic cause; they resulted rather from the ineradicable Hellenic idea of independence of cities. His main conclusions from the *stelai* of payments of tribute were: that the number of cities in the empire did not approach the thousand mentioned by Aristophanes, but probably lay between three hundred and four hundred at the utmost; that the assessments were made for an indefinite period and readjusted only on special occasions, most often in Panathenaic years for convenience, if at all, and at irregular intervals; and that estimates of the total amount, fixed in the beginning by Aristides at 460 talents, can be satisfactorily made only by careful study of individual years.

The transition from papers in ancient history to papers in medieval history was marked by a contribution from Professor Paul van den Ven, formerly of the University of Brussels, now of Princeton, entitled "When did the Byzantine Empire and Civilization come into Being?" His main object was to controvert such opinions as that of Bury, that all lines of demarcation which have been drawn between the Roman empire and the Byzantine empire are arbitrary, and that, great as were the changes undergone by the empire since antiquity, it never ceased to be the Roman empire, and, changing gradually and continuously, offers no point at which one can properly give it a new name. Professor van den Ven criticized such views of unity and continuity as justified only in political doctrine but contrary to historical facts. From the time of Arcadius and Honorius, East and West began to be in fact distinct; Italy and Rome were no longer the centre around which the empire revolved; "Byzantine art", "Byzantine civilization", "Graeco-Roman law", are accepted terms, corresponding to admitted facts; a Christian, bureaucratic government, centring at Constantinople, a society increasingly Greek and Oriental in character, justify a new term.

The first of the papers lying distinctly in the field of medieval history was that of Professor K. Asakawa, of Yale University, on the Life of a Monastic *Shō* in Medieval Japan. He set forth at the outset the points wherein the Japanese *shō* of the twelfth century resembled the manor of medieval Europe and wherein it differed, and suggested that, after the entrance of the warrior into the *shō*, the latter came gradually to assume the aspects of the regular fief. He then took up the history of the triple *shō* of Kōno-Makuni-Sarukawa under the Buddhist monastery of Mt. Koya as typifying certain phases of this conversion. This *shō*, originating as it did in commendations of lands, at first included varied and changeable tenures.

It also comprised two classes of men, "landholders", some of whom were armed, and "cultivators" below them. During the feudal years, especially between 1333 and 1600, the multiple tenures tended to be simplified into grants held in fief of the monastic seignior; at the same time, some "cultivators" seem to have risen in status, and formed the bulk of the new rural population, on the same level with the old "landholders", who no longer appeared as half-warriors. The warriors had been largely differentiated and become professional. By 1600 the triple *shō* had, in its institutional structure, been as nearly altered into a fief as a religious *shō* could be. Professor Dana C. Munro, of Princeton, after the close of the paper, remarked upon the light that students of medieval feudalism in Europe might derive from the comparative study of Japanese feudalism, upon the meagreness of the Western literature upon the subject, and upon the resemblance of the *shō* to the fief rather than the manor.

Upon the question, "Was there a Common Council before Parliament?" Professor Albert B. White, of the University of Minnesota, argued against the view, exhibited in many reputable books, that the English assembly which came to be called Parliament was at some earlier time called the "common council", a view sometimes giving rise to notions of primitive democratic or national traits. A search of the English sources from the Conquest to about 1250 has brought to light some 175 cases of the phrase *commune consilium* (never *concilium*). In more than half of these the meaning is either "public opinion" or the general understanding, consent, or advice of groups more or less vague, often very small. In over sixty cases the "common counsel" came clearly from an assembly of considerable size, summoned for a definite purpose, but still the phrase means rather the result, action, or spirit of the group than the group itself. In five rather vague cases, from the reign of Henry III., the personification seems to lie in the direction of the council, but of the small council rather than the larger, summoned assembly.

An interesting paper by Professor Chalfant Robinson, of Princeton, entitled History and Pathology, presented a plea for a deeper study, on the part of historians, of the pathological aspects of human minds and characters in influential station, but was substantially a discussion of the individual case of Louis XI., based on the materials collected by Dr. A. Brachet, in his privately printed monograph entitled *Pathologie Mentale des Rois de France*.

Bridging the transition from medieval to modern history, the

paper presented by Professor Albert H. Lybyer, of the University of Illinois, on Constantinople as Capital of the Ottoman Empire, began with the time when the Turks under Mohammed II., acquiring a city that was not much more than an incomparable site covered with ruins, proceeded to rebuild it in their own way, with modest private residences but with substantial and sometimes magnificent public edifices. Their efforts to repopulate were also described, and the spontaneous processes by which, in a century and a half, a cosmopolitan city of seven or eight hundred thousand people was formed; likewise the avenues of commerce and the conditions of trade within the walls. In political life, the strong central position of the city contributed to the durability of the Ottoman government, established in the cluster of buildings at Seraglio Point. In religion, Constantinople continued to be the metropolis of the Orthodox Church and became the seat of the Caliphate, the chief centre of the Moslem faith, and the home of its principal university. The causes of its progressive decline, and of its partial modernization in the nineteenth century, were traced, and the possibilities of its future development touched upon.

The beginnings of a military power of quite the opposite curve of development were narrated by Professor Sidney B. Fay, of Smith College, in a paper on the Beginnings of the Standing Army in Prussia, which we hope to have the pleasure of presenting to our readers in a later number. The origins of the permanent active field army maintained by the Great Elector did not lie in the Thirty Years' War, but in the Northern War of 1655-1660, during which he was compelled to create an army on a basis largely independent of his provincial estates. The paper traced his subsequent expansion and development of this novel force.

A paper entitled "The Stuart Period: Unsolved Problems", by Professor Wallace Notestein, of the University of Minnesota, was limited by its author to the earlier half of the seventeenth century, and to parliamentary history. Despite the high merits and great extent of Gardiner's researches, the speaker urged the need of more intensive study of the history of Parliament in this period, showing that a considerable body of new materials has come to light; that old materials, such as the *Commons Journals* and the widely-copied manuscripts of speeches in the Commons, are less authoritative than Gardiner assumed; that the history of the Stuart Parliaments must be studied in the light, still imperfect, of earlier parliamentary development; and that there is a range of problems respecting Parliament which Gardiner left almost untouched—such

matters, for instance, as the electoral campaigns for the Parliaments of James and Charles, the deeper questions of the character of their membership, and the rise of the organized opposition to the king.

Professor Notestein's paper was discussed by Professor Roland G. Usher, of Washington University, St. Louis, who declared that the legal and institutional problems left unsolved by Gardiner were quite as numerous and significant as the parliamentary. Especially needed are studies of the growth and development of the administrative councils, the prerogative courts, and particularly of the courts of common law, instead of whose actual history in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries we have been content to study the views about its history which the judges of that time wrote down for us. A first-hand investigation must be made of the voluminous and scattered original records of all these bodies and of the materials bearing on their mutual relations. A critical edition of the first volume of the *Commons Journals* is also much needed. For researches so laborious, co-operative effort is required, and investigators in the earlier Stuart period, 1603-1640, are asked to communicate with Professor Usher, or with Professor A. P. Newton of the University of London, who desire to organize historical work in this period.

In a slightly later period, a paper by Professor Guernsey Jones, of the University of Nebraska, entitled "Beginnings of the Oldest European Alliance", treated of Anglo-Portuguese relations from 1640 to 1661. The treaty of 1654, Portugal's penalty for assisting the Stuarts and defying the regicides, was the source of Portugal's "commercial vassalage", commonly but erroneously attributed to the Methuen Treaty of 1703. It secured every concession which the English merchants trading in Portugal saw fit to ask for, and was long regarded by them as the Magna Carta of their privileges and immunities. Charles II.'s Marriage Treaty of 1661, which determined the whole course of his foreign policy in a direction different from that of his original inclinations, was due at bottom to the desire of the English court to placate the commercial classes of London, by retaining Jamaica against the opposition of Spain, and by opening the way to the trade in India.

Another of the papers in English history, that of Professor Arthur L. Cross, of Michigan, on English Criminal Law and Benefit of Clergy during the Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Centuries, is printed in the present issue of this journal, as is also that which was read by Professor Jesse S. Reeves, of the same university, on Two Conceptions of the Freedom of the Seas.

In the same session as the latter, the session relating to conflicts concerning the European balance of power, Professor William E. Lingelbach, of the University of Pennsylvania, read an effective paper on England and Neutral Trade in the Napoleonic and Present Wars.² With many interesting details derived from contemporaneous documents, he set forth the comparison between the English policy toward neutral trade in the Napoleonic Wars and the efforts then made, through that policy, to preserve maritime ascendancy, and the policy and methods pursued toward the same ends in the present war. The seizures of neutral vessels in 1793, the parliamentary acts of 1795, and the crushing blows inflicted by and in consequence of the *Essex* decision and the Orders in Council of 1807, were exhibited as measures intended not only to protect Great Britain against the consequences of aggression and fraud but to secure to her by the most extreme assertion of belligerent rights a complete commercial supremacy, not through the destruction of American and other neutral commerce, but through processes which compelled it to serve her own purposes. The system of licenses, and its abuse, were carefully described. After a century during which the world had been comparatively free from maritime warfare and during which its opinion tended strongly toward favor of neutral rights as against the claims of belligerents, a tendency in which England as well as the United States had participated, the situation of the neutral, so far as the doctrines of international law was concerned, was much better in 1914 than at the beginning of the century, but the exigencies of Great Britain's situation led her to develop a system of control of ocean commerce far beyond any which the framers of the old Orders in Council had devised. The Order in Council of August 20, 1914, followed by that of March 11, 1915, constituted, in the language of the American government, "a practical assertion of unlimited belligerent rights over neutral commerce within the whole European area and an almost unqualified denial of the sovereign rights of the nations now at peace".

In a session specially devoted to the Great Peace Congresses of the Nineteenth Century, three cognate papers of high value were read, on the Congresses of Vienna, Paris, and Berlin, by Professor Charles D. Hazen, of Columbia University, Mr. William R. Thayer, of Cambridge, and Professor Robert H. Lord, of Harvard, respectively. It is expected that they will shortly appear together in a small volume.³ It was intended that the papers should treat of the

² To be printed in the *Military Historian and Economist*.

³ Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company.

organization and methods of procedure of these congresses, and not of their problems or results. Thus, Mr. Hazen described the manner in which the Congress of Vienna approached its problems, the character of its organization, if organization it can be called when no plenary session was ever held, its method of procedure—merely that of ordinary diplomatic negotiations, save for the mutual proximity of the negotiators—and the machinery of its Committee of Five. Similarly, Mr. Thayer described the convening, personnel, circumstances, mechanism, and operations of the Congress of Paris, Mr. Lord those of the Congress of Berlin, with a much larger degree of attention to its political events and results.

Professor Charles Seymour, of Yale University, in a careful and comprehensive paper on the *Ententes* and the Isolation of Germany,^{3a} essayed to determine whether the conflict of alliances marked by the crises of 1905, 1908, and 1911 was due to endeavors of the Triple Entente to encircle and isolate Germany, or indicated merely a defensive struggle on their part, to maintain the balance of power. He first described the German interpretation of events, the theory of the *Einkreisungspolitik*, in accordance with which England was the centre of a plot to isolate Germany and block her expansion. The Anglo-French *entente* of 1904, the Anglo-Russian convention of 1907, the Anglo-French and Anglo-Belgian military conversations, the Russian attitude toward Austria and Turkey, the course of these powers in respect to Albania, the check to Germany at the time of the Agadir episode, the Serbian intrigues against Austria, Russia's military preparations in 1913, all had received explanation in the light of this theory. The speaker held, however, that nothing in the agreements of 1904 and 1907 indicated an intention of isolating Germany, that the military conversations alluded to, and the British support of France in general, carried in them no evidence of any but a defensive policy, and that the lack of co-ordination in the diplomatic activities of the *entente* powers during 1912, 1913, and 1914, and the nature of British treaties made with Germany in the same period, were inconsistent with the German theory. Professor Bernadotte E. Schmitt, of Western Reserve University, in remarks after the paper, agreed with these views, partly on the basis of diplomatic documents, partly because of the obvious desire of the Asquith government to avoid trouble abroad, in the interest of a domestic programme of social reform.

Other papers dealing, most interestingly, with the most recent periods of history, other than American, were those of Professor Archibald C. Coolidge, of Harvard University, on Claims upon Con-

^{3a} Printed in the *Yale Review* for April.

stantinople, National, Geographical, and Historic, of Mr. Edward T. Williams, of the Department of State, on Chinese Social Institutions as a Foundation for Republican Government, and of Dr. James A. Robertson on the Philippine Islands since the Inauguration of the Philippine Assembly. The last-named of these is to be printed in the next issue of this journal.

Mr. Williams's paper related mainly to present social institutions and to the present era of reform in China, which may be said to have begun in 1898, but he first described three earlier occasions on which large social reforms were undertaken: in 221 B. C. when the emperor Shi Hwang-ti attempted to abolish the feudal system, at the beginning of the Christian era when the emperor Wang Mang tried to abolish slavery and private property in land, and in A. D. 1069 when the councillor Wang-shih entered on a similar programme of drastic social legislation. In China of the present day most land is held in small parcels and cultivated by its owners; the family, not the individual, is the political unit. Such a system favors democracy, and experience in clan councils has been a valuable training for political association. Villages are practically autonomous. The guilds, which are as powerful as those of Europe in the Middle Ages, often constituting the real municipal government of the towns in which they are placed, are democratic in organization. Confucianism, in the opinion of the foremost native scholars, is not imperialistic in tendency, and Buddhism is distinctly democratic. The dense ignorance of the masses is the main obstacle to the success of republican institutions. The paper, however, which was replete with interesting historical examples, exhibited the remarkable progress made in the last four years of the Manchu régime, in the establishment of representative government in city, province, and nation, as strong evidence of capacity for self-government, based on social institutions already existing and on long experience in their operation.

Professor Kenneth S. Latourette, of Denison University, adverted to the hampering effects of particularism, the want of a truly national patriotism, but hoped that the civil service and the administrative machinery perfected during long years of monarchy might, as they had done in France, carry over into a republican period, and promote and fortify centralization. Dr. Stanley K. Hornbeck, of the University of Wisconsin, admitting the capacity of the Chinese and the value of their lower institutions as a basis for national self-government, commended the caution of the more conservative states-

men of recent years in view of the want of immediate readiness and the immensity of the task of transformation.

It remains to speak of the papers in American history, two of them relating to the Revolutionary period, two to the earlier portion of the nineteenth century, and five to the period converging on secession and the Civil War. There was also a paper by Mr. Augustus H. Shearer, of the Newberry Library, on American Historical Periodicals, in which their history and characteristics were compendiously treated under appropriate classifications.

The paper of Professor Arthur M. Schlesinger, of the Ohio State University, entitled "The Uprising against the East India Company",⁴ was an attempt to trace the actual execution of the boycott agreements of 1770 against dutied tea adopted in the leading provinces of British America. From contemporary comments and official commercial statistics of the British government, it is apparent that these agreements were totally ignored in all places save New York and Philadelphia, which were the centres of tea-smuggling in America. But this complaisant attitude toward dutied tea underwent an abrupt and radical change when a new act of Parliament, in May, 1773, provided that the East India Company might export tea directly to America, *i. e.*, without passing it through the hands of the various middlemen as before. Eliminating most of the middlemen's profits, this new act enabled colonial consumers to buy the company's tea cheaper than either dutied tea privately imported, or smuggled tea. Hence colonial tea-merchants, whether dealing in the customed or in the contraband article, joined forces in fomenting popular opposition to the company; and this was enlarged by the fear of other merchants that the company might next proceed to extend its monopoly to other articles. Fear of mercantile monopoly, rather than of taxation without representation, was the mainspring of American opposition.

The other paper in the American Revolutionary period was a careful study, by Professor James A. James, of Northwestern University, of Spanish Influence in the West during the American Revolution, dealing especially with the period before formal participation of Spain in the war against Great Britain. The main matters described were the successful endeavors of the Virginia government to obtain powder and other supplies from New Orleans, the activities of Oliver Pollock as agent of that government, the additional activity displayed in assisting the colonies after the accession of Governor Galvez, and the mutual dealings of Pollock and George

⁴ To be printed in the *Political Science Quarterly*.

Rogers Clark. The first paper relating to the ensuing period was one in which Mr. Charles L. Chandler, of Chattanooga, narrated the services which an American merchant captain and privateer, Charles Whiting Wooster, grandson of General David Wooster, rendered as captain and rear-admiral in the Chilean navy, 1817-1819 and 1822-1847.

Dr. Reginald C. McGrane, of the University of Cincinnati, in a paper on the Pennsylvania Bribery Case of 1836, gave an account of scandals which accompanied the effort of Nicholas Biddle and his associates to secure the passage of a bill granting a state charter to the Second United States Bank. Beginning their efforts soon after it became clear that a renewal of the national charter by Congress was not to be expected, the advocates of the bank set out to achieve their desired result in the state legislature, by three methods: by the constant work of skilled lobbyists upon the appropriate committees in the two houses; by offering members of the legislature liberal grants for their respective counties in the form of projects of internal improvements to be carried out through applications of the bonus receivable from the bank; and by threatening the legislature that the act of incorporation should be secured from the legislatures of other states, in which case the advantages of the bank's capital would go elsewhere. The bill passed the House by means of Whig and Anti-Masonic votes under the able leadership of Thaddeus Stevens, and then the Senate. The most significant feature of the struggle was the dramatic disclosure, by one of the senators, of efforts to secure his vote by bribery. Investigating committees of the two houses exonerated the bank men of direct attempts at bribery, and it is plain that they had preferred to offer grants in the form of schemes of internal improvement, rather than to use direct means. It seems not wholly certain whether the senator involved in the scandal was their dupe or their tool. Yet it is known that \$400,000 was withdrawn from the bank under suspicious circumstances, at the time of the recharter, and that Biddle was willing to use this in case of dire necessity.

Lastly, five of the papers related to the period of or leading to the Civil War: those of Miss Laura A. White, professor in the University of Wyoming, on Robert Barnwell Rhett and South Carolina, 1826-1852, of Professor Robert P. Brooks, of the University of Georgia, on Howell Cobb and the Crisis of 1850, of Professor Ernest A. Smith, of Salt Lake City, on the Influence of the Religious Press of Cincinnati on the Northern Border States, of Professor James R. Robertson, of Berea College, on Sectionalism

in Kentucky from 1855 to 1865, and of Professor Charles W. Ramsdell, of the University of Texas, on the Confederate Government and the Railroads.

Miss White traced the radical and independent course of R. B. Rhett, and his influence on the politics of South Carolina, from his entrance into the state legislature in 1826 and his action soon after in forcing Calhoun to bring forward his programme of nullification. In Congress after 1837 he was prominent as a leader of the Calhoun faction. When Calhoun, defeated in the effort to obtain control of the Democratic nominating convention of 1844, decided to throw his full support to Polk, Rhett, intent on state action against the tariff, took the risk involved in opposing Calhoun and inaugurated the "Bluffton Movement". Although Calhoun succeeded at the time in checking the movement for state interposition, the younger generation had been initiated into a more advanced stage of South Carolina radicalism. After the Wilmot Proviso, Rhett for five years devoted himself to a struggle for separate secession of the state, against those who would move only in co-operation with other states. His failure at the time, and the course by which in the end his influence prevailed, were clearly depicted.

Professor Brooks's paper sought to establish the fact that Howell Cobb, known afterward chiefly as an ardent advocate of secession and of extreme Southern views, had before that time been a Democrat of strong nationalist tendencies. In support of this view, he cited his speeches on the Texas question, the Mexican War, and the Oregon question, and especially his conduct in respect to the Compromise of 1850, when he was Speaker of the national House of Representatives. He was one of the foremost advocates of that compromise, regarding it as the best obtainable adjustment of a dispute that looked ominous for the Union. Breaking with lifelong political associates, for most of its opponents in Georgia and in the South generally were Democrats, he brought the people of that pivotal state to acquiesce in it, definitely committing Georgia to the Compromise by the successful canvass he made for the governorship in 1851 on the Union ticket. The remaining part of the paper treated of the disruption of the Union party brought about by disagreement between the Whig and the Democratic elements over the preliminaries of the election of 1852. Cobb was left stranded with only a small following of Union Democrats. His course on the issues of 1850 had so completely alienated him from the Democratic majority that he never regained his former popularity.

In Professor Robertson's paper, the close relation between the

course of political parties in Kentucky during the decade 1855-1865 and the features of the state's physical geography was established, and was displayed on a series of maps specially prepared from returns of elections, both state and national. Yet the period was one of transition, and there was much shifting of sectional political sentiment, concerned with the issues of state rights, union, secession, slavery, sound currency, internal improvements, and many minor interests.

Professor Ramsdell's paper, on the Confederate Government and the Railroads, was a study in war administration. The first outstanding fact, the heaviest handicap of the South in waging war, was its lack of industrial development, which resulted not only in want of necessary supplies, but also in the lack of sufficient men with training in industrial administration to organize and administer its resources. In 1861 the Southern railroads were local short lines, light in both track and rolling stock, unconnected, without co-ordination, and generally inadequate to the work suddenly imposed upon them. They could not themselves combine or co-ordinate, and confusion and congestion of traffic resulted; they were unable to obtain supplies, and rapid deterioration set in. The government was unable to aid them, partly because of constitutional scruples, partly through a failure to comprehend the nature of the problem. It granted loans to build certain connections and it sought relief from congestion by supervision of its own freights, but it never found a remedy for the breakdown of the roads themselves. The consequence was the paralysis of the whole system of transportation and distribution, the starvation and disintegration of the Confederate armies, and the collapse of the government.

The annual business meeting, presided over by Professor Burr as president, differed from preceding business meetings in two important respects, the one a matter of procedure, the other a matter of substantial achievement, namely, the revision of the society's constitution. Votes respecting procedure passed a year before⁵ had provided that hereafter the annual reports of committees should not be read in the business meeting unless their reading should be called for by ten members present, or directed by the Council. On the present occasion only two such reports were designated by the Council to be read, and only these two were orally presented. The wholesale omission of the reports, with these two exceptions, was justified in this present year by the need to save time for due consideration of constitutional amendments and by-laws; but it may well be

⁵ *American Historical Review*, XXI. 465.

doubted whether at ordinary meetings the omission, which under the rule will usually take place, will be advantageous to the Association. In ordinary years the doings of these committees are the most important activities of the Association, yet, under the practice now inaugurated, it will not be long before most of the members will know little about them. The present healthy spirit of interest in all affairs of the society will be in danger of declining for want of known objects on which to expend itself, and the committees may miss much helpful co-operation which might come to them from interested members as a result of oral presentation of their problems, plans, and achievements.

The secretary's report stated the total membership as 2739, a net loss of 217, due chiefly to the present more rigid practice as to listing members delinquent in respect to payment of dues. The treasurer reported net receipts of \$9919 during the year, net disbursements of \$9353, and assets of \$28,021, a gain of \$959. The secretary of the Council reported the re-election of Professor Carl Becker as a member of the Board of Editors of this journal, for the regular term of six years. He also reported the list of assignments to committees and the budget drawn up by the Council. The former is, as usual, printed as an appendix to this article.

The other chief actions of the Council, mentioned in its report, were its recommendation that the next annual meeting should take place in December, 1917, at Philadelphia (adopted by the Association)—the meeting of 1918 is thought likely to be held in Minneapolis, and that of 1919 in New Haven; its proposal for the issue of a quarterly bulletin (adopted); and its organization of itself into four standing committees—on finance, on the docket, on meetings and relations, and on appointments—for the better distribution, consideration, and despatch of business. According to the plan proposed for the bulletin, the first of its quarterly issues will contain full records of the annual meeting and of the recent council meetings, and like matter; the second, the long-needed list of members; the third, probably, personal news, and notes of the Association's various activities; the fourth, the preliminary programme of the annual meeting. Going to all members four times a year, usually in February, May, September, and November, this bulletin of the Association will inform them of its affairs far more promptly than it is possible to do through the *Annual Reports*, now sadly in arrears. The first number for the present year will probably be issued to the members in April.

The report annually rendered by the Pacific Coast Branch was

presented by its president, and representative on the present occasion, Professor Edward Krehbiel, of Stanford University. For the Committee on the Justin Winsor Prize, its chairman, Professor Carl R. Fish, reported a recommendation that that prize be awarded to Mr. Richard J. Purcell, of St. Paul, Minnesota, for a monograph entitled "Connecticut in Transition, 1775-1818". In the absence of the chairman of the Board of Editors of the *American Historical Review*, the report of that board was read by Professor Becker. The only part of it which it may be useful to mention here is its declaration that, limited as is the number of articles which the *Review* can publish in a year, the offering of contributions by young and unknown writers is distinctly welcomed by the Board.

The amendments to the constitution of the Association which had been presented by the Committee of Nine at the business meeting a year before, and which in accordance with the constitution had been referred to the present meeting for action, were unanimously adopted, as also the by-laws then recommended by the same committee. The Committee of Five appointed to devise a plan for the taking over of this journal by the Association brought in a report recommending—and the recommendations were at once unanimously adopted—that the Board of Editors should execute an assignment to the Association of all its right and title in its contract with the Macmillan Company as publishers, together with a bill of sale of tangible property and good-will, and that the affairs of the *Review* should for the present, and until other action of the Association, remain in the hands of the Board of Editors under the same system as hitherto, except that they should make a detailed report of their accounts annually to the Council and to the Association. The Special Committee on Finance, appointed at the last annual meeting, recommended a more complete application of the budget principle, the keeping of separate accounts for the publication fund and for the life-membership receipts, and a number of other improvements in the details of fiscal procedure.⁶

The report of the Committee on Nominations was presented by its chairman, Professor Frank M. Anderson, of Dartmouth College. The committee had received primary ballots from 291 members. In accordance with its recommendations, Mr. Worthington C. Ford was elected president of the Association for the ensuing year, Mr. William R. Thayer first vice-president, Professor Edward Channing

⁶ The proposed amendments to the constitution and the proposed by-laws were printed in this *Review*, XXI. 464-465; for the recommendations offered and votes passed at Cincinnati, see the *Bulletin*. The transfer of the *Review* is at present being effected.

second vice-president; Mr. Waldo G. Leland, Dr. Clarence W. Bowen, Mr. A. Howard Clark, and Professor Evarts B. Greene were re-elected to their respective offices of secretary, treasurer, curator, and secretary of the Council; and the following six members were elected members of the Council: Professors Eugene C. Barker, Guy S. Ford, Samuel B. Harding, Ulrich B. Phillips, Lucy M. Salmon, and George M. Wrong. The amended constitution now requiring the choice of eight elective councillors, Professor Henry E. Bourne and Mr. Charles Moore were also elected. Messrs. Charles H. Ambler, Frank M. Anderson, Christopher B. Coleman, Henry B. Learned, and Andrew C. McLaughlin, all nominated from the floor, were chosen as Committee on Nominations for the ensuing year; this committee has since chosen Professor Anderson as its chairman.

Of other matters in the history of the Association, much the most important is the endeavor, set in motion at the final meeting of the Council, to increase the endowment of the Association from its present figure of about \$28,000 to that of \$50,000. The movement is due to the initiative of the treasurer, Dr. Bowen, to whom, during his long service of nearly thirty-three years in that office, the organization is already so much indebted. An auspicious beginning has already been made, and members will before long have a general opportunity to help forward the effort.

All evidences, indeed, show convincingly that the American Historical Association is now in the most prosperous condition, with resources and activities increasing, and interest widespread.

J. F. J.

OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

President, Worthington C. Ford, Boston.

First Vice-President, William R. Thayer, Cambridge.

Second Vice-President, Edward Channing, Cambridge.

Secretary, Waldo G. Leland, 1140 Woodward Building, Washington.

Treasurer, Clarence W. Bowen of New York (address 1140 Woodward Building, Washington).

Secretary of the Council, Evarts B. Greene, Urbana, Ill.

Curator, A. Howard Clark, Smithsonian Institution.

Executive Council (in addition to the above-named officers) :

Andrew D. White, ¹	William A. Dunning, ¹
Henry Adams, ¹	Andrew C. McLaughlin, ¹
James Schouler, ¹	H. Morse Stephens, ¹
James Ford Rhodes, ¹	George L. Burr, ¹
John B. McMaster, ¹	Eugene C. Barker,
Simeon E. Baldwin, ¹	Henry E. Bourne,
J. Franklin Jameson, ¹	Guy S. Ford,
George B. Adams, ¹	Samuel B. Harding,
Albert Bushnell Hart, ¹	Charles Moore,
Frederick J. Turner, ¹	Ulrich B. Phillips,
William M. Sloane, ¹	Lucy M. Salmon,
Theodore Roosevelt, ¹	George M. Wrong.

Committees:

Committee on Programme for the Thirty-third Annual Meeting:

John B. McMaster, chairman; Herman V. Ames, vice-chairman; James H. Breasted, Walter L. Fleming, Howard L. Gray, Carlton J. H. Hayes, Albert E. McKinley, Dana C. Munro, Augustus H. Shearer (*ex officio*).

Committee on Local Arrangements: George W. Pepper, chairman; William E. Lingelbach, vice-chairman; Arthur C. Howland, Raymond W. Kelsey, J. J. Van Nostrand, jr., with power to add to their membership.

Committee on Nominations: Frank M. Anderson, Dartmouth College, chairman; Charles H. Ambler, Christopher B. Coleman, H. Barrett Learned, Andrew C. McLaughlin.

Editors of the American Historical Review: Edward P. Cheyney, chairman; Carl Becker, Ephraim Emerton, J. Franklin Jameson, James H. Robinson, Claude H. Van Tyne.

Historical Manuscripts Commission: Gaillard Hunt, Library of Congress, chairman; Dice R. Anderson, Mrs. Amos G. Draper, Charles H. Lincoln, Milo M. Quaife, Justin H. Smith.

Committee on Justin Winsor Prize: Carl R. Fish, University of Wisconsin, chairman; Edward S. Corwin, Frank H. Hodder, Everett Kimball, Oswald G. Villard.

Committee on the Herbert Baxter Adams Prize: Laurence M. Larson, University of Illinois, chairman; Sidney B. Fay, Robert H. Lord, Louis J. Paetow, Miss Ruth Putnam.

¹ Ex-presidents.

Public Archives Commission: Victor H. Paltsits, chairman; Clarence W. Alvord, Solon J. Buck, John C. Fitzpatrick, George N. Fuller, George S. Godard, Peter Guilday, Thomas M. Owen.

Committee on Bibliography: George M. Dutcher, chairman; Herbert E. Bolton, William T. Laprade, Albert H. Lybyer, Wallace Notestein, William W. Rockwell, Augustus H. Shearer, William A. Slade, Bernard C. Steiner.

Committee on Publications: H. Barrett Learned, Washington, chairman; and (*ex officio*) George M. Dutcher, Carl R. Fish, Evarts B. Greene, Gaillard Hunt, J. Franklin Jameson, Laurence M. Larson, Waldo G. Leland, Victor H. Paltsits.

Committee on Membership: William E. Lingelbach, University of Pennsylvania, chairman; Robert P. Brooks, Miss Eloise Ellery, Robert H. George, Patrick J. Healy, Edward M. Hulme, Waldo G. Leland (*ex officio*), Charles R. Lingley, Miss Eleanor Lord, John P. McConnell, Albert E. McKinley, Frank E. Melvin, William A. Morris (*ex officio*), Miss Irene T. Myers, Paul F. Peck, R. C. Ballard Thruston, Royal B. Way.

Committee on a Bibliography of Modern English History: Edward P. Cheyney, University of Pennsylvania, chairman; Wilbur C. Abbott, Arthur L. Cross, Roger B. Merriman, Conyers Read.

Committee on History in Schools: Henry Johnson, Teachers College, chairman; Miss Victoria A. Adams, Henry E. Bourne, Henry L. Cannon, Philip Chase, Oliver M. Dickerson, Herbert D. Foster, Samuel B. Harding, Daniel C. Knowlton, August C. Krey, Robert A. Maurer, Nathaniel W. Stephenson, Rolla M. Tryon, William L. Westermann.

Conference of Historical Societies: Chairman to be selected by the programme committee; Augustus H. Shearer, secretary.

Advisory Board of the History Teacher's Magazine: Henry Johnson, Teachers College, chairman; Frederic Duncalf, Miss Anna B. Thompson, O. H. Williams (these four hold over); Fred M. Fling, James Sullivan (elected for three years).

Committee on the Military History Prize: Robert M. Johnston, Cambridge, chairman; Milledge L. Bonham, jr., Allen R. Boyd, Fred M. Fling, Albert Bushnell Hart.

Committee on Co-operation with the National Highways Association: Archer B. Hulbert.